

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
6

7 BRYAN CALDERON,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY INSURANCE  
COMPANY,

11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:23-cv-01040-RFB-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 13]

12 Pending before the Court is a proposed discovery plan that contains a number of errors.  
13 Docket No. 13. As examples, (1) the caption identifies the discovery plan as an “amended” version  
14 even though a prior version has not been filed; (2) the caption references Local Rule 26-1(e), which  
15 does not exist; (3) the discovery plan references Local Rule 26-1(d), which applies to interpleader  
16 actions and is not implicated here; and (4) the caption indicates that the discovery plan is both  
17 “submitted in compliance” with Local Rule 26-1(b) and that it seeks “special scheduling review,”  
18 which does not make sense, *see* Local Rule 26-1(a) (explaining that the discovery plan is *either*  
19 submitted in compliance with Local Rule 26-1(b) *or* the parties are seeking special scheduling  
20 review). Counsel must carefully review the operative local rules,<sup>1</sup> update their discovery plan, and  
21 file a notice of corrected image by September 13, 2023.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: September 7, 2023

24  
25   
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge  
26

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The operative local rules were amended on April 17, 2020, and are available on the  
Court’s website.